

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-6 and 14 are allowed.

Claims 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 12 is rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under the second paragraph 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 7, 8, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,047,861 to Houchin et al. (hereinafter "Houchin") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,211 to Weideman et al. (hereinafter "Weideman").

The acknowledgement, in the Office Action, of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and that the certified copy of the priority document has been received, is noted with appreciation.

To date, no Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been received. Applicant respectfully requests receipt of this document when it becomes available. Please note that the original drawings filed in the patent application are "formal" drawings.

Claims 7, 12, 13, and 15 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claim 12 has been amended to substitute ‘brightness’ for ‘resolution,’ and therefor correctly recites “correcting image field edge brightness reductions.” It is respectfully submitted that the amendment overcomes the rejection under the second paragraph 35 U.S.C. § 112. Moreover, because the amendment is not made in response to a rejection over the prior art, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment is not a narrowing amendment, and *Festo* does not apply.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

The rejection of claims 7, 8, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Houchin patent in view of the Weideman patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Houchin teaches a means of correcting an image by capturing “calibration data for each pixel under known illumination conditions and to produce individual correction values for each pixel.” *See* Houchin abstract. Weideman teaches a method for removing offset and shading from a video signal so that resolution measurement of an optical sensor may be automated. *See* column 2, lines 5-11.

Amended claim 7 recites *inter alia* “...storing predetermined resolution correction data each set in advance for each one of predetermined blocks which are obtained by dividing the entire area of the image captured by the image pickup element into at least a central area and a peripheral area, wherein at least one of the predetermined blocks corresponds to a plurality of pixels.” Thus, claim 7 requires that at least one predetermined block includes multiple pixels. Houchin teaches that [a] calibration data is

stored for each pixel and provides no teaching of calibration data that applied to multiple pixels. Weideman only teaches a method of measuring sensor resolution. Accordingly, the references taken singly or in combination fail to teach the elements of claim 7.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7, and therefore distinguishes over Houchin and Weideman for at least the same reasons as provided above regarding claim 7.

Amended claim 13 recites *inter alia* storing resolution correction data “for each one of predetermined blocks ..., wherein at least one of the blocks corresponds to a plurality of pixels.” Thus, claim 13 requires that at least one predetermined block, and therefore at least one resolution correction datum corresponds to multiple pixels. Houchin teaches storing calibration data for each pixel, whereas Weideman teaches automated measurement of sensor resolution. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features of claim 13 not taught by either Houchin or Weideman.

Amended claim 15 recites *inter alia* storing resolution correction data “for each one of a predetermined plurality of multi-pixel blocks.” As discussed herein above, this is not taught by either Houchin or Weideman. Therefore, claim 15 distinguishes over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Houchin patent in view of the Weideman patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/817,525  
Amendment dated March 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004


This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Michael J. DeHaemer  
Registration No. 39,164  
Attorney for Applicant

MJD:pm:bar  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3335  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
March 18, 2005